REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-4 are pending.

Declaration Objection

The Office objects to the declaration stating that it does not identify the present application by number and filing date, and that the inventor's signature and date is not legible.

A legible copy of the declaration as originally filed has been provided herewith. The original declaration identifies the specification to which it is directed by referring to the title of the specification in the body of the declaration (*see* Declaration, 3rd ¶). Accordingly, the copy of the original declaration meets the requirement of identifying the specification to which it is directed (*see* 37 C.F.R. 1.63 and MPEP §§601.01(a), 602). Applicant respectfully requests that the illegible declaration be replaced with the copy of the original provided herewith, and that the objection be withdrawn.

Drawings Objection

The Office objects to the drawings stating that they include reference numbers not mentioned in the description. Specifically, reference numbers 87 (of Fig. 9), 516, 520, 620, 781, 793, and 1040 have been cited as not being mentioned in the description (*Office Action* p.2).

Reference number 87 in Fig. 9 has been deleted. Step 620, illustrated as "Register Controls" in Fig. 6, is mentioned at page 15, line 3. Control angle 781, illustrated in Fig. 7B, is mentioned at page 22, line 17. Distance 793, illustrated in

Fig. 7B, is mentioned at page 22, line 6. Appropriate amendments to the description for the remaining reference numbers, 516, 520, and 1040, have been provided herein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the drawings objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,596,347 to Robertson et al. (hereinafter, "Robertson"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Robertson describes a system that determines an intended cursor location on a computer display and automatically repositions the cursor at the intended location. Robertson utilizes a control list storage area to store a list of possible cursor locations for a screen display (Item 28 of Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 8-10). The controls of a screen display are loaded into the control list when the screen display is altered (Step 56 of Fig. 2A; col. 6 lines 54-56). The controls are stored individually in the control list so that they may be sequentially analyzed to select a location at which the cursor will be positioned (Step 58-64 of Fig 2A; col. 6, lines 60-62).

In the present Application, Applicant describes a data structure that includes a provision for aggregating a group of controls, referred to as a control group, and for defining the control group as active or inactive (*Specification* p.10, lines 16-22). A control group identifier designates which control group a particular control belongs to (*Specification* p.16, lines 7-9) when each particular control is identified in the data structure. In this manner, a convenient method is

provided to activate or deactivate a fraction of the controls registered in the data structure (*Specification* p.19, lines 6-16).

Claim 1 describes, in a computer system having a video display device with a screen, a method of "identifying a control group, the control group being comprised of at least two controls", "representing the control group with a single status indicator", and "directing the activation of the controls of the control group by storing an active value in the single status indicator."

The Office contends that Robertson identifies a control group and represents the control group with a single status indicator that directs the activation of the controls of the control group (*Office Action* p.3). This is incorrect. Robertson does not identify a control group, represent a control group with a single status indicator, or direct the activation of the controls of a control group by storing an active value in the single status indicator.

First, Robertson does not describe any *grouping* of controls. In Robertson's system, all controls of a screen display are stored in a control list. There is nothing in this control list suggesting any particular grouping.

Second, Robertson does not represent a group of controls with a single status indicator. The only indicator described in Robertson is a default selection flag data bit that indicates which *one* of the individually stored controls in the control list is the default selection (col. 5, lines 23-28).

Third, Robertson does not direct the activation of grouped controls by storing an active value in the single status indicator. Rather, Robertson activates only a single control based on an analysis of each control in the control list.

Thus, at least three elements of claim 1 are entirely missing from the reference relied on in rejecting claim 1. No other references have been cited to

remedy these deficiencies. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Robertson, and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, claim 2 defines a cursor which is displayed on the screen of the video display device and further defines the method recited in claim 1 by "identifying a location on the screen that the cursor points to" and "for each control of the control group, identifying a control position, the control position defining a location on the screen for the activated control ..."

The Office suggests that Robertson discloses identifying a control position for each control of the control group, the control position defining a location on the screen for the activated control (*Office Action* p.3). As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, however, Robertson does not suggest a control group, and thus, cannot suggest identifying a control position for each control *of a control group*.

Claim 2 also describes that "for each control of the control group, ... determining a control distance, the control distance defining a control connecting path which connects the identified location with the control position, calculating a control angle, the control angle being an angle formed between the control connecting path and a last direction of cursor movement path, and calculating a weighted distance."

Robertson does not teach or suggest this combination of features described in claim 2. The Office cites Robertson col. 2, lines 22-56, and col. 4, lines 42-55 for disclosing these features. However, neither of these sections of Robertson disclose "determining a control distance", "calculating a control angle", or

"calculating a weighted distance." Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Robertson.

Claim 3 defines an apparatus for activating and deactivating a control grouping having "a control grouping identifier contained within the memory, wherein the control grouping identifier has an active state and an inactive state and wherein the control grouping identifier represents the controls of the control grouping."

The Office suggests that Robertson discloses a control grouping identifier (*Office Action* p.3) referring to Robertson's cursor location signal at col. 4, lines 42-45: "A current location storage area ... contains the cursor control signals (i.e., X and Y coordinates) corresponding to the current location of the cursor on the display." The Robertson section describes the Cartesian coordinates of the cursor location. Robertson does not disclose "a control grouping identifier" as suggested by the Office because Robertson does not suggest control groups in the first place.

Furthermore, the Office contends that Robertson discloses that the identifier has an active state and an inactive state and the identifier represents the controls of the control grouping (*Office Action* p.4). The Office cites Robertson col. 6, lines 34-46, which describes storing the location of the cursor so that the location can be returned to in the event that the location needs to be returned to. This section of Robertson has nothing to do with a "control grouping identifier [that] has an active state and an inactive state and wherein the control grouping identifier represents the controls of the control grouping."

Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over Robertson, and the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 3. Additionally, claim 4 describes that "the control grouping identifier is a bit of a control word." The Office cites Robertson's default selection flag data bit as a control grouping identifier (*Office Action* p.4). As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, however, the default selection flag data indicates which of the individually stored controls in the control list is the one default selection. The Robertson default selection flag is not a control grouping identifier as recited in claim 4. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable over Robertson.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _July 6, 2000_   By: _/Daniel L. Hayes/_
                              Daniel L. Hayes
                              Reg. No. 34,618
                              (509) 324-9256